arXiv:1601.02195v1 [math-ph] 10 Jan 2016

Quantum Anomalies and Logarithmic Derivatives

J.E. Gough[(a)], T. S. Ratiu[(b)], and O. G. Smolyanov[(c)]

a) Institute of Mathematics, Physics, and Computer Sciences,
Aberystwyth University, Great Britain
email: jug@aber.ac.uk
b) Section de Mathmatiques and Bernoulli Center,
École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne,
CH-1015 Switzerland
email: tudor.ratiu@epfl.ch
c) Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty,
Moscow State University, Moscow, 119991 Russia
email: smolyanov@yandex.ru

Abstract

This papers deals with connections between quantum anomalies and transformations of Feynman pseudo-measures. Mathematical objects related to the notion of the volume element in an infinite-dimensional space considered in the physics literature [1] are considered and disagreement in the related literature regarding the origin of quantum anomalies is explained.

1 Introduction

A quantum anomaly is the violation of a symmetry (see [4]) with respect to some group of transformations under quantization. That is, a situations where a classical Hamiltonian system exhibits an invariance with respect to some transformations however the same is not true for its quantization (see [2]).

There is some degree of disagreement in the related literature regarding the origin of quantum anomalies. An explanation is given by in the 2004 edition of Fujikawa and Suzuki's well-known book [1], however, in the 2006 monograph of Cartier and DeWitt-Morette [2, page 352], it is claimed that this description as to why quantum anomalies occur given is incorrect. The second edition of [1] in 2013 however did not address this criticism of their book. Our contribution in this paper is to analyze the problem from the point of view of Feynman pseudo-measures (defined in the next section), and conclude that description of the emergence of quantum anomalies given in [1] is essential correct.

We shall use the fact that the transformations of a functional Feynman integral (i.e., an integral with respect to a Feynman pseudo-measure) are determined by transformations of two distinct objects:

1. The first of these is the product of a Feynman pseudo-measure with a certain function integrable with respect to this pseudo-measure, which is, in turn, the product of the exponential of a part of the classical action and the initial condition. The exponential of the other part of the action determines the Feynman pseudo-measure. If the action and the initial condition are invariant with respect to some transformation, then this object is invariant with respect to this transformation as well.

2. The second object is a determinant, which plays the role of a Jacobian; this determinant may differ from unity even in the case where the action and the initial conditions are invariant with respect to phase transformations; of course, in this case, the Feynman integral is non-invariant as well.

What is said above agrees in spirit with the viewpoint of [1]. The authors in [2] proposed however to compensate for this determinant by multiplying the measure with respect to which the integration is performed[1] by an additional factor, which, of course, is equivalent to multiplying the integrand by the same factor.

In this paper, we consider families of transformations of the domain of a (pseudo)measure depending on a real parameter and show that such a compensation is impossible; for this purpose, we use differentiation with respect to this parameter. The paper is organized as follows. First, we recall two basic definitions of the differentiability of a measure and, more generally, a pseudo-measure (distribution); then, we give explicit expressions for the logarithmic derivatives of measures and pseudo-measures with respect to transformations of the space on which they are defined. The application of these expressions[2] makes it possible to obtain a mathematically correct version of results of [1] concerning quantum anomalies. After this, we discuss the approach to explaining the same anomalies proposed in [2]. We also discuss mathematical objects related to the notion of the volume element in an infinite-dimensional space considered in physics literature (including [2]). We concentrate on the algebraic structure of problems, leaving aside most assumptions of analytical character.

2 Differentiation of Measures and Distributions

In this section we recall some definitions, conventions, and results about differentiable measures and distributions on infinite-dimensional spaces in a form convenient for our purposes.

[1] Of course this counterpart of the classical Lebesgue measure does not exist in the infinite-dimensional case according to the well-known theorem of Weil, but it is not important in this context because the counterpart can be considered as a pseudomeasure.

[2] Among other things, these formulas lead to infinite-dimensional versions of both the First and Second Noether Theorems

Definition 1 *Given a locally convex space (LCS) E, we denote the σ-algebra of Borel subsets of E by $\mathcal{B}_E$, and the vector space of countably additive (complex) measures on E by $\mathfrak{M}_E$. We say that the vector space C of bounded Borel functions on E determines a norm if, for any measure in $\mathfrak{M}_E$, its total variation $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_E$ satisfies the condition $\|\mu\|_1 = \sup\left\{ \int u d\mu \,:\, u \in C,\, \|u\|_\infty \leq 1 \right\}$, where $\|u\|_\infty = \sup\{|u(x)| : x \in E\}$.*

A *Hilbert subspace* of an LCS E is defined as a vector subspace H of E endowed with the structure of a Hilbert space such that the topology induced on H by the topology of E is weaker than the topology generated by the Hilbert norm. We now define the notion of smooth maps, of a LCS, along a Hilbert subspace.

Definition 2 *A mapping F of an LCS E to an LCS G is said to be smooth along a Hilbert subspace H of E (or H-smooth) if it is infinitely differentiable along H and both the mapping F and all of its derivatives (along H) are continuous on E, provided that the spaces in which the derivatives take values are endowed with the topologies of uniform convergence on compact subsets of H.*

The class of vector fields on a LCS is introduced next.

Definition 3 *A vector field on an LCS E is a mapping $h : E \mapsto E$; we denote the set of vector fields on E by $Vect(E)$. The derivative along a vector field $h \in Vect(E)$ of a function f defined on E is the function on E denoted by $f'h$ and defined by*

$$(f'h)(x) := f'(x)\, h(x), \qquad \forall x \in E,$$

where $f'(x)$ is the Gâteaux derivative of f at the point x.

Let $\epsilon > 0$, and let S be a mapping of the interval $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ to the set of $\mathcal{B}_E$-measurable self-mappings of E for which $S(0) = id$; suppose that τ is a topology on E compatible with the vector space structure. A measure $\nu \in E$ is said to be τ-differentiable along S if the function

$$\begin{aligned} f \quad &: \quad (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \mapsto (\mathfrak{M}_E, \tau), \\ &: \quad t \mapsto S(t)_* \nu := \nu(S(t)^{-1}), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

is differentiable at $t = 0$ (the symbol $S(t)_*\nu$ denotes the image of ν under the mapping $S(t)$); in this case, we denote $f'(0)$ by v'_S and call it the *derivative of the measure ν* along S. If, in addition, $f' \ll f(0)$ then we may furthermore define the logarithmic derivatives for the density.

Definition 4 *Suppose that the mapping (1) is differentiable at $t = 0$, and that the measure $f'(0)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $f(0)$, then its density with respect to the measure $f(0)$ is called the τ-logarithmic derivative of the measure ν along S and denoted by β^v_S.*

If $k \in E$ and $S(t)(x) := x - tk$, then a measure ν which is τ-differentiable along S is said to be τ-differentiable along k, and $\nu' k$ is defined by $\nu' k = v'_S$; the τ-logarithmic derivative of the measure ν along S is called the τ-logarithmic derivative of ν along k and denoted by $\beta^\nu(k, \cdot)$. The τ-differentiability of a measure along a vector field h and its τ-logarithmic derivative along h (denoted by β^ν_h) are defined in a similar way: we set

$$S(t)(x) := x - t\, h(x).$$

If a measure ν is τ-differentiable along each $k \in E$, then it can be shown that the mapping $E \ni k \mapsto \nu' k$ is linear; the corresponding vector-valued measure

$$\nu' : \mathcal{B}_E \ni A \mapsto [k \mapsto (\nu' k)(A)]$$

is called the τ-derivative of ν over the subspace H. If, for any $k \in H$, there exists a τ-logarithmic derivative measure ν along k, then the mapping $H \ni k \mapsto \beta_\nu(k, \cdot)$ is linear; it is called the *τ-logarithmic derivative of ν* over (or along) H and denoted by β_ν.

Remark 5 *If the measure ν has a logarithmic derivative over a subspace E and $h(x) \in H$ for all $x \in E$, then, contrary to what one might expect,*

$$\beta^\nu_S(x) \neq \beta_\nu(h(x), x)$$

in the general case (see below).

Remark 6 *If τ is the topology of convergence on all sets, then any measure that is τ-differentiable along S will have a logarithmic derivative along τ (see [12]), however this may not ne the case for weaker topologies. An example is as follows. In the case where the LCS E is also a Radon space*[3]*, let S be the space of bounded continuous functions on E, and let τ_C be the weak topology on $\mathfrak{M}_E$ determined by the duality between C and $\mathfrak{M}_E$. Then a measure τ_C-differentiable along S may have no logarithmic derivative along S (even in the case $E = \mathbb{R}^1$).*

Definition 7 *Let C be a norm-defining vector space of H-smooth functions on E bounded together with all derivatives. A measure ν is said to be C-differentiable along a vector field $h \in Vect(E)$ if there exists a measure ν'_h such that, for any $\varphi \in C$, we have the integration by parts formula*

$$\int \varphi'(x)(x)\nu(dx) = -\int \varphi(x)\,(\nu'_h)\,(dx).$$

The Radon-Nikodym density of ν'_h with respect to ν (if it exists) is called the C-logarithmic derivative of the measure ν along h; if $h(x) = h_0 \in E$ for all $x \in E$, then, as above, the C-logarithmic derivative of ν along h is called the C-logarithmic derivative of ν along h_0

[3] A topological space E is called a Radon space if any countably additive Borel measure ν on E is Radon; this means that, for any Borel subset A of E and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set $K \subset A$ such that $\nu(A\ K) < \epsilon$. If E is a completely regular Radon space, then the space of all bounded continuous functions on E is in natural duality with $\mathfrak{M}_E$.

Note that we denote C-logarithmic derivatives by the same symbols as τ-logarithmic derivatives introduced above as there should be no confusion.

Suppose that a vector field h_S is determined by $h_S(x) := S'(0)x$. Then the following proposition is valid.

Proposition 8 *A measure ν is τ_C-differentiable along S if and only if it is C-differentiable along h_S. In this case, $\beta^\nu_{h_S} = \beta^\nu_S$, where $\beta^\nu_{h_S}$ is the C-logarithmic derivative of ν along h_S and β^ν_S is the τ_C-logarithmic derivative of ν along S.*

Proof. This follows from the change of variable formula. Suppose that $\varphi \in C$ and, as above, $f(t) := (S(t))_*\nu$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t\to 0} t^{-1} \int_E \varphi(x)(f(t))(dx) - \int_E \varphi(x)(f(0))(dx) \\ = & \lim_{t\to 0} t^{-1} \int_E \varphi(x)((S(t))_*\nu)(dx) - \int_E \varphi(x)\nu(dx) \\ = & \lim_{t\to 0} t^{-1} \int_E (\varphi(S(t)) - \varphi(x))\, \nu(dx) = \int_E \varphi'(x)_S(x)\nu(dx), \end{aligned}$$

which gives the stated result. ■

Corollary 9 *Let S_1 be another mapping of the interval $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ to $\mathcal{B}_E$ with the same properties as S. If $h_S = h_{S_1}$, then the measure ν is τ_C-differentiable along S if and only if it is τ_C-differentiable along S_1.*

Remark 10 *It is natural to say that the measure ν is invariant with respect to S if $\beta^\nu_S = 0$.*

Theorem 11 *Suppose that a measure $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}_E$ has a τ_C-logarithmic derivative over a subspace H, and let h be a vector field on E taking values in H . Then*

$$\beta^\nu_h(x) = \beta^\nu\,(h(x), x) + \operatorname{tr} h'(x),$$

where h' is the derivative of the mapping h over the subspace H.

Proof. Suppose that $\varphi \in C$ and h is a vector field on E, and let μ be the E-valued measure defined by

$$\mu' = h'(\cdot)\varphi(\cdot)\nu + \varphi(\cdot)\nu' \otimes h(\cdot) + \varphi'(\cdot) \otimes h(\cdot)\nu.$$

Applying the Leibniz rule to the derivative of μ over the subspace H, we obtain

$$\operatorname{tr}\mu' = (\varphi(\cdot)\operatorname{tr}h'(\cdot))\,\nu + \varphi(\cdot)\beta^\nu(h(\cdot), \cdot)\nu + \varphi'(\cdot)h(\cdot)\nu.$$

Each summand in this relation is a measure whose values are operators on H; calculating the traces of these operators, we obtain

$$\operatorname{tr}\mu' = (\varphi(\cdot)\operatorname{tr}h'(\cdot))\,\nu + \varphi(\cdot)\beta^\nu(h(\cdot), \cdot)\nu + \varphi'(\cdot)h(\cdot)\nu.$$

Since $\int_E \mu'(dx) = 0$ and, therefore, $\int_E \mathrm{tr}\mu'(dx) = 0$, it follows that

$$\int_E \varphi'(x)h(x)\nu(dx) = -\int_E \varphi(x)\big[\beta^\nu(h(x),x) + \mathrm{tr}h'(x)\big]\nu(dx).$$

This means that the required relation holds. ■

Both the definitions given above and the algebraic parts of proofs can be extended to distributions (in the Sobolev-Schwartz sense) defined as continuous linear functionals on appropriate spaces of test functions. The difference is that the integrals of functions with respect to measures should be replaced by values of these linear functionals at functions, and instead of the change of variables formula for integrals, the definition of the transformation of a distribution generated by a transformation of the space on which the test functions are defined should be used.

3 Quantum Anomalies

In fact, quantum anomalies arise because the second term in the relation of Theorem 11 proved above is the same for all Feynman (pseudo)measures. Indeed, by virtue of Leibniz rule, the logarithmic derivative (both over a subspace and along a vector field) of the product of a function and a measure is the sum of the logarithmic derivatives of the factors; therefore, a measure ν whose logarithmic derivative along a vector field is given by the expression in Theorem 11 can formally be taken for the product of a function $\psi_n u$ whose logarithmic derivative over the subspace H coincides with the logarithmic derivative of the measure ν over this subspace and a measure η whose logarithmic derivative over the same subspace vanishes. If E is finite-dimensional and H coincides with E, then such a function and a measure indeed exist; moreover, η turns out to be the Lebesgue measure, and ψ_ν is the density of ν with respect to it.

But in the infinite-dimensional case, there exist no exact counterpart of the Lebesgue measure; nevertheless, an analogue of density, called the generalized density of a measure, does exist [3, 10, 12], although its properties are far from those of usual density, and the corresponding distribution can be regarded as an analogue of the Lebesgue measure. It is this distribution that should be considered as a formalization of the term - volume element - used in [2, p. 362]. We however emphasize that the contents of this paper depends on the properties of neither this distribution nor the generalized density.

Let Q be a finite-dimensional vector space being the configuration space of a Lagrangian system with Lagrange function $L : Q \times Q \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ defined by $L(q_1, q_2) := \eta(q_1, q_2) + b(q_2)$, where b is a quadratic functional (the kinetic energy of the system). We assume that the Lagrange function L is nondegenerate (hyperregular), i.e., the corresponding Legendre transform is a diffeomorphism, so that it determines a Hamiltonian system with Hamiltonian function $\mathcal{H} : Q \times P \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, where $P = Q^*$.

For $t > 0$, by E_t we denote the set of continuous functions on $[0, t]$ taking values in Q and vanishing at zero and by H_t, the Hilbert subspace of E_t consist-

ing of absolutely continuous functions on $[0,t]$ with square integrable derivative; the Hilbert norm on E_t is defined by

$$\|f\|^2_{H_t} := \int_0^t \|f'(\tau)\|^2_Q d\tau$$

where $f \in E_t$ and $\|\cdot\|_Q$ is the Euclidean norm on Q. Finally, by $\mathscr{S}(t)(f)$ we denote the classical action defined as the functional on H_t determined by the Lagrangian function L according to

$$\mathscr{S}(t)(f) := \int_0^t L(f(\tau), \dot{f}(\tau))d\tau.$$

The Schrödinger quantization of the Hamiltonian system generated by the Lagrangian system described above yields the Schrödinger equation $\mathrm{i}\dot{\psi}(t) = \widehat{\mathcal{H}}\psi(t)$, where $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ is a self-adjoint extension of a pseudo-differential operator on $\mathcal{L}_2(Q)$ with symbol equal to the Hamiltonian function H generated by the Lagrange function L . The solution of the Cauchy problem for this equation with initial condition f_0 is

$$\psi(t)(q) = \int_{E_t} e^{\mathrm{i}\int_0^t \eta(\psi(\tau)+q,\dot{\psi}(\tau))d\tau} f_0(\psi(t)+q)\phi_t(d\psi), \tag{2}$$

where ϕ_t is the Feynman pseudo-measure on E_t (the exponential under the integral sign is well defined on the space H_t).

Let W_t be the pseudo-measure on E_t defined as the product of the exponential in the above integral and the psuedo-measure ϕ_t. The following theorem is valid.

Theorem 12 *The logarithmic derivative of the pseudo-measure W_t along H_t exists and is determined by*

$$\beta^{W_t}(k,\psi) = \mathrm{i}\int_0^t \left[L_1'(\psi(\tau)+q,\dot{\psi}(\tau))\,k(\tau) + L_2'(\psi(\tau)+q,\dot{\psi}(\tau))\,\dot{k}(\tau)\right] d\tau$$

where $k \in H_t$, $\psi \in E_t$.

Corollary 13 *If h is a vector field on E_t taking values in H_t, then the logarithmic derivative of the pseudo-measure W_t along h is determined by*

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_h^{W_t}(\psi) =& \mathrm{i}\int_0^t \left[L_1'\left(h(\psi)(\tau)+q, \frac{dh(\psi)}{d\tau}(\tau)\right) h(\psi)(\tau)\right.\\ &\left. + L_2'\left(h(\psi)(\tau)+q, \frac{dh(\psi)}{d\tau}(\tau)\right)\frac{dh(\psi)}{d\tau}(\tau)\right] d\tau + \operatorname{tr} h'(\psi).\end{aligned}$$

A similar assertion is valid for the logarithmic derivative along a family $S(\alpha)$ of transformations of the space E_t depending on a parameter $\alpha \in (-\epsilon,\epsilon)$.

It follows from Corollary 9 that if the classical action $\mathscr{S}(t)$ is invariant with respect to a family $S(\alpha)$, $\alpha \in (-\epsilon,\epsilon)$, of transformations of the space E_t,

then the logarithmic derivative $\beta_S^W(\psi)$ does not necessarily vanish. In turn, this means that if a Lagrange function is invariant with respect to a family of transformations of the configuration space and hence the action is invariant with respect to the corresponding gauge transformations then the solution of the corresponding Schrödinger equation is not necessarily invariant with respect to the same gauge transformations.

Remark 14 *For each family $S(\alpha)$ of transformations of the space E_t, we can obtain an explicit expression for the transformations of the psuedo-measure W_t generated by the transformations $S(\alpha)$ by solving the equation $\dot{g}(\alpha) = \beta^{\nu}_{S(\alpha)} g(\alpha)$ (see [10]). It follows [10] that if $\operatorname{tr}\left(h_{S(\alpha)}\right)'(\psi) > 0$, for $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_0]$, , then $det(S(\alpha))' \neq 1$; this fact does not depend on the classical action.*

Remark 15 *Using the notion of the generalized density of a pseudo-measure (cf. [3, 10, 11], where only generalized densities of usual measures were considered), we can say that the pseudo-measure W_t is determined by its generalized density being the exponential in the Feynman integral (2). Moreover, as mentioned above, the expression for the transformations of the pseudo-measure contain determinants, and the expressions for the corresponding logarithmic derivatives contain traces, which do not depend on the generalized densities. This can be interpreted by treating the Feynman pseudo-measure as the product of its generalized density and distribution whose transformations are described by the corresponding determinants and traces, and the logarithmic derivatives of this distribution along constant vectors vanish. In turn, this allows us to say that the distribution mentioned above corresponds to the volume element considered in [2].*

Remark 16 *Thus, the determinants and traces mentioned above cannot be eliminated by any choice of the integrand and the Feynman pseudo-measure if the corresponding Feynman integrals are required to represent the solutions of the corresponding Schrödinger equation. Clearly, this contradicts [2, p. 362].*

Remark 17 *If E is a superspace, then, instead of traces and determinants, we should use supertraces and superdeterminants.*

Acknowledgements

T.S. Ratiu acknowledges the partial support of Swiss National Science Foundation, grant no. Swiss NSF 200021-140238. J. Gough and O.G. Smolyanov acknowledge the partial support of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Lausanne (EPFL). O.G. Smolyanov acknowledges the support of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, project no. 14-01-00516.

References

[1] K. Fujikawa and H. Suzuki, Path Integrals and Quantum Anomalies (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2004; 2nd ed., 2013).

[2] P. Cartier and C. DeWitt-Morette, Functional Integration (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2006).

[3] A.I. Kirillov, Russ. Math. Surv. 49 (3), 43-95 (1994).

[4] J.E. Marsden and T.S. Ratiu, Introduction to Mechanics and Symmetry (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994; 2nd ed., 2003).

[5] M.E. Peskin and D.V. Schroeder, An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory (Addison-Wesley, Boston, 1995).

[6] S. Weinberg, Quantum Theory of Fields (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995-2000), Vols. 1-3.

[7] O.G. Smolyanov, in Trends in Stochastic Analysis (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2009), pp. 283-302.

[8] O.G. Smolyanov and A. Truman, Theor. Math. Phys. 119 (3), 677-686 (1999).

[9] O.G. Smolyanov and H. von Weizsäcker, J. Funct. Anal. 118 (2), 454-476 (1993).

[10] H. von Weizsäcker, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris. Ser. I Math. 321 (1), 103-108 (1995).

[11] J. Montaldi and O. G. Smolyanov, Russ. J. Math. Phys. 21 (3), 379-385 (2014).

[12] O. G. Smolyanov and H. von Weizsäcker, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. 2 (1), 51-78 (1999).